



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/589,612

08/16/2006

Tamie Oyanagi

28951.5496

8662

53067 7590 06/08/2009

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

ELBIN, JESSE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/08/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 24, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to develop the flame resistant wax of the claimed range, Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Examiner agrees that Table 1 (page 6) illustrates several differences between the prior art foil wire and the foil wire according to the instant invention, the broadest reasonable interpretation of claim 1 yields a wire (according to Table 1, wax 'A') with very similar statistics as the prior art foil wire, therefore the foil wire produced with wax 'A' does not yield any unexpected results. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art, with a minimal amount of experimentation would have been motivated to try e.g. the commercially available product used by applicant to produce a copper foil with similar flame resistance, etc. as the prior art wire. Table 1, waxes 'B' and 'C', however, appear to produce an 'unexpected' (compared to the prior art foil wire) increase in the flame resistance of the wire (according to UL-94). Since the scope of the range in claim 1 (specifically the stated range of flame retardant) is larger than that of waxes 'B' and 'C' in Table 1, it is still broadly covering a range wherein the results of a particular wax mixtures (e.g. 5 wt% for wax 'A') would be 'expected'.

2. /CURTIS KUNTZ/

3. Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614